

REMARKS

The drawings have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). The Examiner has indicated that the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the back part with no portions extending outwardly over the abutment of the front part must be shown or the features cancelled from the claims.

The Applicant does not consider the hinge to be either a portion of the front part or the back part. The hinge is not essential as the pack may be in two separate parts. The hinge 28, if provided, is a separate element simply co-joining the front and back parts.

Claim 12 states that the location means become inter-engaged to close the pack, only when the back part is contained wholly within the recessed portion of the front part. If Figure 2 shows the whole of the back part contained wholly within the recessed portion of the front part, then the hinge 28 is a separate part and is not a part of either the back part or the front part of the pack. Accordingly, there is no part of the back part which extends outwardly from the recessed portion of the front part when the pack is closed, but only a separate hinge part.


By looking at Figure 3 of the drawings, you will see that the hinge 28 projects outwardly from the rear edges of the front and back parts of the pack but in terms of the closure, plays no part whatsoever. The hinge is only effective when the pack is open, to keep the front and back parts together. Thus, with reference to Figure 2, it may be regarded that the back part finishes at the narrow flange 30, so that none of the back part extends outwardly of the abutment 29 of the front part when the pack is closed. It is just this feature that makes it difficult for the pack to be opened, which is of course quite

deliberate, as opposed to the prior art shown in Figure 1 where the flange 20 is readily accessible to open the pack. Thus, the Applicant requests that the Examiner request that the drawing objection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-10 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. The claim dependencies have been amended and thus, the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn. In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the amended claims and the claims dependent there from are in proper form. The Applicant respectfully contends that the drawings show every feature of the invention specified in the claims under provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). Thus, claims 2-10 and 12 should be considered patently distinguishable over the prior art of record and in proper form.

The application is now considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early indication of same is earnestly solicited

Respectfully submitted,



Arlene J. Powers
Registration No. 35,985
Gauthier & Connors
225 Franklin Street, Suite 2300
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
Telephone: (617) 426-9180
Extension: 110